

checked by IT  
on 9/6/17

# CERTIFICATION

SDG No: JC25442 Laboratory: Accutest, New Jersey  
Site: BMSMC, Building 5 Area, PR Matrix: Groundwater

**SUMMARY:** Groundwater samples (Table 1) were collected on the BMSMC facility – BMSMC, Building 5 Area, PR. The BMSMC facility is located in Humacao, PR. Samples were taken July 22-26, 2016 and were analyzed in Accutest Laboratory of Dayton, New Jersey for 1,4-Dioxane and Naphthalene. The results were reported under SDG No.: JC25442. Results were validated using the latest validation guidelines (July, 2015) of the EPA Hazardous Waste Support Section. The analyses performed are shown in Table 1. Individual data review worksheets are enclosed for each target analyte group. The data sample organic data samples summary form shows for analytes results that were qualified.

In summary the results are valid and can be used for decision taking purposes.

Table 1. Samples analyzed and analysis performed

SAMPLE ID	SAMPLE DESCRIPTION	MATRIX	ANALYSIS PERFORMED
JC25442-1	OSMW-4D	Groundwater	1,-4-dioxane and Naphthalene (SIM)
JC25442-1	OSMW-4D	Groundwater	1,-4-dioxane (SCAN)
JC25442-2	OSMW-4S	Groundwater	1,-4-dioxane and Naphthalene (SIM)
JC25442-2	OSMW-4S	Groundwater	1,-4-dioxane (SCAN)
JC25442-2D	OSMW-4S MSD	Groundwater	1,-4-dioxane and Naphthalene (SIM)
JC25442-2S	OSMW-4S MS	Groundwater	1,-4-dioxane and Naphthalene (SIM)
JC25442-3	OSMW-5D	Groundwater	1,-4-dioxane and Naphthalene (SIM)
JC25442-3	OSMW-5D	Groundwater	1,-4-dioxane (SCAN)
JC25442-4	OSMW-5S	Groundwater	1,-4-dioxane and Naphthalene (SIM)
JC25442-4	OSMW-5S	Groundwater	1,-4-dioxane (SCAN)

Reviewer Name: Rafael Infante  
Chemist License 1888

Signature:  
Date:

*Rafael Infante*  
August 16, 2016



SGS Accutest

## Report of Analysis

Page 1 of 1

<b>Client Sample ID:</b>	OSMW-4D	<b>Date Sampled:</b>	08/05/16
<b>Lab Sample ID:</b>	JC25442-1	<b>Date Received:</b>	08/06/16
<b>Matrix:</b>	AQ - Ground Water	<b>Percent Solids:</b>	n/a
<b>Method:</b>	SW846 8270D BY SIM SW846 3510C		
<b>Project:</b>	BMSMC, Building 5 Area, PR		

	File ID	DF	Analyzed	By	Prep Date	Prep Batch	Analytical Batch
Run #1	F159723.D	1	08/10/16	AD	08/09/16	OP96175A	EF6717
Run #2	4M67260.D	1	08/10/16	JJ	08/09/16	OP96175A	E4M3041

	Initial Volume	Final Volume
Run #1	1000 ml	1.0 ml
Run #2	1000 ml	1.0 ml

CAS No.	Compound	Result	RL	MDL	Units	Q
91-20-3	Naphthalene	ND <sup>a</sup>	0.10	0.029	ug/l	
123-91-1	1,4-Dioxane	28.4	1.0	0.049	ug/l	

CAS No.	Surrogate Recoveries	Run# 1	Run# 2	Limits
4165-60-0	Nitrobenzene-d5	66%	62%	24-125%
321-60-8	2-Fluorobiphenyl	66%	52%	19-127%
1718-51-0	Terphenyl-d14	76%	89%	10-119%

(a) Result is from Run# 2



ND = Not detected MDL = Method Detection Limit  
 RL = Reporting Limit  
 E = Indicates value exceeds calibration range

J = Indicates an estimated value  
 B = Indicates analyte found in associated method blank  
 N = Indicates presumptive evidence of a compound

SGS Accutest

## Report of Analysis

Page 1 of 1

<b>Client Sample ID:</b>	OSMW-4S	<b>Date Sampled:</b>	08/05/16
<b>Lab Sample ID:</b>	JC25442-2	<b>Date Received:</b>	08/06/16
<b>Matrix:</b>	AQ - Ground Water	<b>Percent Solids:</b>	n/a
<b>Method:</b>	SW846 8270D BY SIM SW846 3510C		
<b>Project:</b>	BMSMC, Building 5 Area, PR		

	File ID	DF	Analyzed	By	Prep Date	Prep Batch	Analytical Batch
Run #1	F159724.D	1	08/10/16	AD	08/09/16	OP96175A	EF6717
Run #2	4M67273.D	1	08/10/16	JJ	08/09/16	OP96175A	E4M3041

	Initial Volume	Final Volume
Run #1	970 ml	1.0 ml
Run #2	970 ml	1.0 ml

CAS No.	Compound	Result	RL	MDL	Units	Q
91-20-3	Naphthalene	ND <sup>a</sup>	0.10	0.030	ug/l	
123-91-1	1,4-Dioxane	49.8	1.0	0.050	ug/l	

CAS No.	Surrogate Recoveries	Run# 1	Run# 2	Limits
4165-60-0	Nitrobenzene-d5	73%	65%	24-125%
321-60-8	2-Fluorobiphenyl	69%	55%	19-127%
1718-51-0	Terphenyl-d14	76%	91%	10-119%

(a) Result is from Run# 2



ND = Not detected      MDL = Method Detection Limit  
 RL = Reporting Limit  
 E = Indicates value exceeds calibration range

J = Indicates an estimated value  
 B = Indicates analyte found in associated method blank  
 N = Indicates presumptive evidence of a compound

SGS Accutest

## Report of Analysis

Page 1 of 1

<b>Client Sample ID:</b>	OSMW-5D	<b>Date Sampled:</b>	08/05/16
<b>Lab Sample ID:</b>	JC25442-3	<b>Date Received:</b>	08/06/16
<b>Matrix:</b>	AQ - Ground Water	<b>Percent Solids:</b>	n/a
<b>Method:</b>	SW846 8270D BY SIM SW846 3510C		
<b>Project:</b>	BMSMC, Building 5 Area, PR		

	File ID	DF	Analyzed	By	Prep Date	Prep Batch	Analytical Batch
Run #1	F159725.D	1	08/10/16	AD	08/09/16	OP96175A	EF6717
Run #2	4M67262.D	1	08/10/16	JJ	08/09/16	OP96175A	E4M3041

	Initial Volume	Final Volume
Run #1	1000 ml	1.0 ml
Run #2	1000 ml	1.0 ml

CAS No.	Compound	Result	RL	MDL	Units	Q
91-20-3	Naphthalene	ND <sup>a</sup>	0.10	0.029	ug/l	
123-91-1	1,4-Dioxane	55.2	1.0	0.049	ug/l	

CAS No.	Surrogate Recoveries	Run# 1	Run# 2	Limits
4165-60-0	Nitrobenzene-d5	64%	54%	24-125%
321-60-8	2-Fluorobiphenyl	59%	45%	19-127%
1718-51-0	Terphenyl-d14	63%	73%	10-119%

(a) Result is from Run# 2



ND = Not detected      MDL = Method Detection Limit  
 RL = Reporting Limit  
 E = Indicates value exceeds calibration range

J = Indicates an estimated value  
 B = Indicates analyte found in associated method blank  
 N = Indicates presumptive evidence of a compound

SGS Accutest

## Report of Analysis

Page 1 of 1

Client Sample ID: OSMW-5S

Lab Sample ID: JC25442-4

Matrix: AQ - Ground Water

Method: SW846 8270D BY SIM SW846 3510C

Project: BMSMC, Building 5 Area, PR

Date Sampled: 08/05/16

Date Received: 08/06/16

Percent Solids: n/a

	File ID	DF	Analyzed	By	Prep Date	Prep Batch	Analytical Batch
Run #1	F159726.D	1	08/10/16	AD	08/09/16	OP96175A	EF6717
Run #2	4M67263.D	1	08/10/16	JJ	08/09/16	OP96175A	E4M3041

	Initial Volume	Final Volume
Run #1	980 ml	1.0 ml
Run #2	980 ml	1.0 ml

CAS No.	Compound	Result	RL	MDL	Units	Q
91-20-3	Naphthalene	ND <sup>a</sup>	0.10	0.030	ug/l	
123-91-1	1,4-Dioxane	55.5	1.0	0.050	ug/l	

CAS No.	Surrogate Recoveries	Run# 1	Run# 2	Limits
4165-60-0	Nitrobenzene-d5	69%	60%	24-125%
321-60-8	2-Fluorobiphenyl	66%	51%	19-127%
1718-51-0	Terphenyl-d14	70%	82%	10-119%

(a) Result is from Run# 2



ND = Not detected MDL = Method Detection Limit

RL = Reporting Limit

E = Indicates value exceeds calibration range

J = Indicates an estimated value

B = Indicates analyte found in associated method blank

N = Indicates presumptive evidence of a compound

**Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate Summary**

Page 1 of 1

Job Number: JC25442

Account: AMANYWP Anderson, Mulholland &amp; Associates

Project: BMSMC, Building 5 Area, PR

Sample	File ID	DF	Analyzed	By	Prep Date	Prep Batch	Analytical Batch
OP96175A-MS	4M67274.D	1	08/10/16	JJ	08/09/16	OP96175A	E4M3041
OP96175A-MSD	4M67275.D	1	08/10/16	JJ	08/09/16	OP96175A	E4M3041
JC25442-2	F159724.D	1	08/10/16	AD	08/09/16	OP96175A	EF6717
JC25442-2	4M67273.D	1	08/10/16	JJ	08/09/16	OP96175A	E4M3041

The QC reported here applies to the following samples:

Method: SW846 8270D BY SIM

JC25442-1, JC25442-2, JC25442-3, JC25442-4

CAS No.	Compound	JC25442-2 ug/l	Spike Q ug/l	MS ug/l	MS %	Spike ug/l	MSD ug/l	MSD %	RPD	Limits Rec/RPD
91-20-3	Naphthalene	ND <sup>a</sup>	2.04	1.54	75	2.04	1.59	78	3	23-140/36
123-91-1	1,4-Dioxane	49.8	2.04	44.8	0* <sup>b</sup>	2.04	42.7	0* <sup>b</sup>	5	20-160/30


CAS No.	Surrogate Recoveries	MS	MSD	JC25442-2	JC25442-2	Limits
367-12-4	2-Fluorophenol	64%	63%			14-81%
4165-62-2	Phenol-d5	54%	53%			11-54%
118-79-6	2,4,6-Tribromophenol	115%	118%			35-145%
4165-60-0	Nitrobenzene-d5	75%	75%	73%	65%	24-125%
321-60-8	2-Fluorobiphenyl	61%	63%	69%	55%	19-127%
1718-51-0	Terphenyl-d14	102%	111%	76%	91%	10-119%

(a) Result is from Run #2.

(b) Outside control limits due to high level in sample relative to spike amount.



\* = Outside of Control Limits.



JC25442: Chain of Custody  
Page 1 of 5

## EXECUTIVE NARRATIVE

SDG No: JC25442 Laboratory: Accutest, New Jersey  
Analysis: SW846-8270D Number of Samples: 6  
Location: BMSMC, Building 5 Area, PR  
Humacao, PR

**SUMMARY:** Six (6) samples were analyzed for Naphthalene and 1,4-Dioxane following method SW846-8270D using the selective ion monitoring (SIM) technique; four of the samples were also analyzed for 1,4-Dioxane following method SW846-8270D in the scan mode. The sample results were assessed according to USEPA data validation guidance documents in the following order of precedence: EPA Hazardous Waste Support Section, SOP HW-35A, July 2015 –Revision 0. Semivolatile Data Validation. The QC criteria and data validation actions listed on the data review worksheets are from the primary guidance document, unless otherwise noted.

Results are valid and can be used for decision making purposes.

**Critical issues:** None  
**Major:** None  
**Minor:** None


**Critical findings:** None  
**Major findings:** None  
**Minor findings:** 1. MS/MSD % recoveries and RPD within laboratory control limits except in the cases described in the Data Review Worksheet. No action taken, MS/MSD % recovery outside control limits due to high level in sample relative to spike amount.

**COMMENTS:** Results are valid and can be used for decision making purposes.

**Reviewers Name:** Rafael Infante  
Chemist License 1888

**Signature:**

**Date:**

  
August 16, 2016



# **SAMPLE ORGANIC DATA SAMPLE SUMMARY**

Sample ID: JC25442-1  
Sample location: BMSMC, Building 5 Area, PR  
Sampling date: 8/5/2016  
Matrix: Groundwater

## **METHOD: 8270D (SIM)**

Analyte Name	Result	Units	Dilution Factor	Lab Flag	Validation	Reportable
Naphthalene	0.10	ug/l	1	-	U	Yes
1,4-Dioxane	-	-	-	-	-	-

## **METHOD: 8270D (SCAN)**

Analyte Name	Result	Units	Dilution Factor	Lab Flag	Validation	Reportable
1,4-Dioxane	28.4	ug/l	1	-	-	Yes

Sample ID: JC25442-2  
Sample location: BMSMC, Building 5 Area, PR  
Sampling date: 8/5/2016  
Matrix: Groundwater

## **METHOD: 8270D (SIM)**

Analyte Name	Result	Units	Dilution Factor	Lab Flag	Validation	Reportable
Naphthalene	0.10	ug/l	1	-	U	Yes
1,4-Dioxane	-	-	-	-	-	-

## **METHOD: 8270D (SCAN)**

Analyte Name	Result	Units	Dilution Factor	Lab Flag	Validation	Reportable
1,4-Dioxane	49.8	ug/l	1	-	-	Yes

Sample ID: JC25442-3  
Sample location: BMSMC, Building 5 Area, PR  
Sampling date: 8/5/2016  
Matrix: Groundwater

## **METHOD: 8270D (SIM)**

Analyte Name	Result	Units	Dilution Factor	Lab Flag	Validation	Reportable
Naphthalene	0.10	ug/l	1	-	U	Yes
1,4-Dioxane	-	-	-	-	-	-

Sample ID: JC25442-3  
Sample location: BMSMC, Building 5 Area, PR  
Sampling date: 8/5/2016  
Matrix: Groundwater

METHOD: 8270D (SCAN)

Analyte Name	Result	Units	Dilution Factor	Lab Flag	Validation	Reportable
1,4-Dioxane	55.2	ug/l	1	-	-	Yes

Sample ID: JC25442-4  
Sample location: BMSMC, Building 5 Area, PR  
Sampling date: 8/5/2016  
Matrix: Groundwater

METHOD: 8270D (SIM)

Analyte Name	Result	Units	Dilution Factor	Lab Flag	Validation	Reportable
Naphthalene	0.10	ug/l	1	-	U	Yes
1,4-Dioxane	-	-	-	-	-	-

METHOD: 8270D (SCAN)

Analyte Name	Result	Units	Dilution Factor	Lab Flag	Validation	Reportable
1,4-Dioxane	55.5	ug/l	1	-	-	Yes

Sample ID: JC25442-2MS  
Sample location: BMSMC, Building 5 Area, PR  
Sampling date: 8/5/2016  
Matrix: Groundwater

METHOD: 8270D (SIM)

Analyte Name	Result	Units	Dilution Factor	Lab Flag	Validation	Reportable
Naphthalene	1.54	ug/l	1	-	-	Yes
1,4-Dioxane	44.8	ug/l	1	-	-	Yes

Sample ID: JC25442-2MSD  
Sample location: BMSMC, Building 5 Area, PR  
Sampling date: 8/5/2016  
Matrix: Groundwater

**METHOD: 8270D (SIM)**

Analyte Name	Result	Units	Dilution Factor	Lab Flag	Validation	Reportable
Naphthalene	1.59	ug/l	1	-	-	Yes
1,4-Dioxane	42.7	ug/l	1	-	-	Yes

# DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

Project Number: JC25442  
 Date: August 5, 2016  
 Shipping Date: August 5, 2016  
 EPA Region: 2

## REVIEW OF SEMIVOLATILE ORGANIC PACKAGE

The following guidelines for evaluating volatile organics were created to delineate required validation actions. This document will assist the reviewer in using professional judgment to make more informed decision and in better serving the needs of the data users. The sample results were assessed according to USEPA data validation guidance documents in the following order of precedence: EPA Hazardous Waste Support Section, SOP HW-35A, July 2015 –Revision 0. *Semivolatile Data Validation*. The QC criteria and data validation actions listed on the data review worksheets are from the primary guidance document, unless otherwise noted.

The hardcopied (laboratory name) Accutest data package received has been reviewed and the quality control and performance data summarized. The data review for SVOCs included:

Lab. Project/SDG No.: JC25442 Sample matrix: Groundwater  
 No. of Samples: 6 SIM/4 SCAN  
 Trip blank No.: -  
 Field blank No.: -  
 Equipment blank No.: -  
 Field duplicate No.: -

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data Completeness	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Laboratory Control Spikes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Holding Times	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Field Duplicates
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GC/MS Tuning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Calibrations
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Internal Standard Performance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Compound Identifications
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Blanks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Compound Quantitation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Surrogate Recoveries	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitation Limits
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate	

Overall Comments: Naphthalene and 1,4-Dioxane analyzed by method SW846-8270D (SIM);  
Sample JC25442-1 to JC25442-4 also analyzed by the scan method

### Definition of Qualifiers:

J- Estimated results  
 U- Compound not detected  
 R- Rejected data  
 UJ- Estimated nondetect

Reviewer: Rafael Infante  
 Date: August 16, 2016

## DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

## DATA COMPLETENESS

### MISSING INFORMATION

DATE LAB. CONTACTED

DATE RECEIVED

[illegible]

# DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

All criteria were met   X    
 Criteria were not met  
 and/or see below           

## HOLDING TIMES

The objective of this parameter is to ascertain the validity of the results based on the holding time of the sample from time of collection to the time of analysis.

Complete table for all samples and note the analysis and/or preservation not within criteria

SAMPLE ID	DATE SAMPLED	DATE EXTRACTED/ANALYZED	pH	ACTION
All samples extracted and analyzed within method recommended holding time. Samples properly preserved except in the cases described in this document.				

Cooler temperature (Criteria:  $4 \pm 2$  °C):           5.4°C          

## Actions

Results will be qualified based on the criteria of the following Table:

**Table 1. Holding Time Actions for Semivolatile Analyses**

Matrix	Preserved	Criteria	Action	
			Detected Associated Compounds	Non-Detected Associated Compounds
Aqueous	No	$\leq 7$ days (for extraction) $\leq 40$ days (for analysis)	Use professional judgment	
	No	$> 7$ days (for extraction) $> 40$ days (for analysis)	J	Use professional judgment
	Yes	$\leq 7$ days (for extraction) $\leq 40$ days (for analysis)	No qualification	
	Yes	$> 7$ days (for extraction) $> 40$ days (for analysis)	J	UJ
	Yes/No	Grossly Exceeded	J	UJ or R
Non-Aqueous	No	$\leq 14$ days (for extraction) $\leq 40$ days (for analysis)	Use professional judgment	
	No	$> 14$ days (for extraction) $> 40$ days (for analysis)	J	Use professional judgment
	Yes	$\leq 14$ days (for extraction) $\leq 40$ days (for analysis)	No qualification	
	Yes	$> 14$ days (for extraction) $> 40$ days (for analysis)	J	UJ
	Yes/No	Grossly Exceeded	J	UJ or R

## DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

All criteria were met   X    
Criteria were not met see below       

### GC/MS TUNING

The assessment of the tuning results is to determine if the sample instrumentation is within the standard tuning QC limits

  X   The DFTPP performance results were reviewed and found to be within the specified criteria.

  X   DFTPP tuning was performed for every 12 hours of sample analysis.

If no, use professional judgment to determine whether the associated data should be accepted, qualified or rejected.

Notes: These requirements do not apply when samples are analyzed by the Selected Ion Monitoring (SIM) technique.

All mass spectrometer conditions must be identical to those used during the sample analysis. Background subtraction actions resulting in spectral distortion are unacceptable

Notes: No data should be qualified based of DFTPP failure.

The requirement to analyze the instrument performance check solution is optional when analysis of PAHs/pentachlorophenol is to be performed by the SIM technique.

List the samples affected:

---

---

---

---

#### Actions:

1. If sample are analyzed without a preceding valid instrument performance check or are analyzed 12 hours after the Instrument Performance Check, qualify all data in those samples as unusable (R).
2. If ion abundance criteria are not met, use professional judgment to determine to what extent the data may be utilized.
3. State in the Data Review Narrative, decisions to use analytical data associated with DFTPP instrument performance checks not meeting the contract requirements.
4. Use professional judgment to determine if associated data should be qualified based on the spectrum of the mass calibration compounds.

## DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

All criteria were met   X    
 Criteria were not met \_\_\_\_\_  
 and/or see below \_\_\_\_\_

### INITIAL CALIBRATION VERIFICATION

Compliance requirements for satisfactory instrument calibration are established to ensure that the instrument is capable of producing and maintaining acceptable quantitative data.

Date of initial calibration:   08/03/16   (SIM)         
 Instrument ID numbers:       GCMS4M        
 Matrix/Level:                   Aqueous/low      

Date of initial calibration:   08/03/16   (SCAN)         
 Instrument ID numbers:       GCMSF        
 Matrix/Level:                   Aqueous/low      

DATE	LAB ID#	FILE	CRITERIA OUT RFs, %RSD, %D, r	COMPOUND	SAMPLES AFFECTED
Initial and initial calibration verification meets the method and guidance validation document performance criteria.					

**Note:**

**Actions:**

Qualify the initial calibration analytes listed in Table 2 using the following criteria:

**Table 3. Initial Calibration Actions for Semivolatile Analysis**

Criteria	Action	
	Detect	Non-detect
Initial Calibration not performed at specified frequency and sequence	Use professional judgment R	Use professional judgment R
Initial Calibration not performed at the specified concentrations	J	UJ
RRF < Minimum RRF in Table 2 for target analyte	Use professional judgment J+ or R	R
RRF ≥ Minimum RRF in Table 2 for target analyte	No qualification	No qualification
%RSD > Maximum %RSD in Table 2 for target analyte	J	Use professional judgment
%RSD ≤ Maximum %RSD in Table 2 for target analyte	No qualification	No qualification



# DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

## Initial Calibration

**Table 2. RRF, %RSD, and %D Acceptance Criteria in Initial Calibration and CCV for Semivolatile Analysis**

Analyte	Minimum RRF	Maximum %RSD	Opening Maximum %D <sup>1</sup>	Opening Maximum %D <sup>1</sup>
1,4-Dioxane	0.010	40.0	± 40.0	± 50.0
Benzaldehyde	0.100	40.0	± 40.0	± 50.0
Phenol	0.080	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether	0.100	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
2-Chlorophenol	0.200	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
2-Methylphenol	0.010	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
3-Methylphenol	0.010	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
2,2'-Oxybis-(1-chloropropane)	0.010	20.0	± 25.0	± 50.0
Acetophenone	0.060	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
4-Methylphenol	0.010	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine	0.080	20.0	± 25.0	± 25.0
Hexachloroethane	0.100	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
Nitrobenzene	0.090	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
Isophorone	0.100	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
2-Nitrophenol	0.060	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
2,4-Dimethylphenol	0.050	20.0	± 25.0	± 50.0
Bis(2-chloroethoxy)methane	0.080	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
2,4-Dichlorophenol	0.060	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
Naphthalene	0.200	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
4-Chloroaniline	0.010	40.0	± 40.0	± 50.0
Hexachlorobutadiene	0.040	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
Caprolactam	0.010	40.0	± 30.0	± 50.0
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	0.040	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
2-Methylnaphthalene	0.100	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	0.010	40.0	± 40.0	± 50.0
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	0.090	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	0.100	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
1,1'-Biphenyl	0.200	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0

DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

Analyte	Minimum RRF	Maximum %RSD	Opening Maximum %D <sup>1</sup>	Opening Maximum %D <sup>1</sup>
2-Chloronaphthalene	0.300	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
2-Nitroaniline	0.060	20.0	± 25.0	± 25.0
Dimethylphthalate	0.300	20.0	± 25.0	± 25.0
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	0.080	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
Acenaphthylene	0.400	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
3-Nitroaniline	0.010	20.0	± 25.0	± 50.0
Acenaphthene	0.200	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
2,4-Dinitrophenol	0.010	40.0	± 50.0	± 50.0
4-Nitrophenol	0.010	40.0	± 40.0	± 50.0
Dibenzofuran	0.300	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	0.070	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
Diethylphthalate	0.300	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
1,2,4,5-Tetrachlorobenzene	0.100	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
4-Chlorophenyl-phenylether	0.100	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
Fluorene	0.200	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
4-Nitroaniline	0.010	40.0	± 40.0	± 50.0
4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	0.010	40.0	± 30.0	± 50.0
4-Bromophenyl-phenyl ether	0.070	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	0.100	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
Hexachlorobenzene	0.050	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
Atrazine	0.010	40.0	± 25.0	± 50.0
Pentachlorophenol	0.010	40.0	± 40.0	± 50.0
Phenanthrene	0.200	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
Anthracene	0.200	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
Carbazole	0.050	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
Di-n-butylphthalate	0.500	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
Fluoranthene	0.100	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
Pyrene	0.400	20.0	± 25.0	± 50.0
Butylbenzylphthalate	0.100	20.0	± 25.0	± 50.0

DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

Analyte	Minimum RRF	Maximum %RSD	Opening Maximum %D'	Opening Maximum %D'
3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	0.010	40.0	± 40.0	± 50.0
Benzo(a)anthracene	0.300	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
Chrysene	0.200	20.0	± 20.0	± 50.0
Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate	0.200	20.0	± 25.0	± 50.0
Di-n-octylphthalate	0.010	40.0	± 40.0	± 50.0
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	0.010	20.0	± 25.0	± 50.0
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	0.010	20.0	± 25.0	± 50.0
Benzo(a)pyrene	0.010	20.0	± 20.0	± 50.0
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	0.010	20.0	± 25.0	± 50.0
Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	0.010	20.0	± 25.0	± 50.0
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	0.010	20.0	± 30.0	± 50.0
2,3,4,6-Tetrachlorophenol	0.040	20.0	± 20.0	± 50.0
Naphthalene	0.600	20.0	± 25.0	± 25.0
2-Methylnaphthalene	0.300	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
Acenaphthylene	0.900	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
Acenaphthene	0.500	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
Fluorene	0.700	20.0	± 25.0	± 50.0
Phenanthrene	0.300	20.0	± 25.0	± 50.0
Anthracene	0.400	20.0	± 25.0	± 50.0
Fluoranthene	0.400	20.0	± 25.0	± 50.0
Pyrene	0.500	20.0	± 30.0	± 50.0
Benzo(a)anthracene	0.400	20.0	± 25.0	± 50.0
Chrysene	0.400	20.0	± 25.0	± 50.0
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	0.100	20.0	± 30.0	± 50.0
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	0.100	20.0	± 30.0	± 50.0
Benzo(a)pyrene	0.100	20.0	± 25.0	± 50.0
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	0.100	20.0	± 40.0	± 50.0
Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	0.010	25.0	± 40.0	± 50.0
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	0.020	25.0	± 40.0	± 50.0

# DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

Pentachlorophenol	0.010	40.0	± 50.0	± 50.0
<b>Deuterated Monitoring Compounds</b>				
Analyte	Minimum RRF	Maximum %RSD	Opening Maximum %D <sup>1</sup>	Closing Maximum %D
1,4-Dioxane-d <sub>8</sub>	0.010	20.0	± 25.0	± 50.0
Phenol-d <sub>5</sub>	0.010	20.0	± 25.0	± 25.0
Bis-(2-chloroethyl)ether-d <sub>8</sub>	0.100	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
2-Chlorophenol-d <sub>4</sub>	0.200	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
4-Methylphenol-d <sub>8</sub>	0.010	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
4-Chloroaniline-d <sub>4</sub>	0.010	40.0	± 40.0	± 50.0
Nitrobenzene-d <sub>5</sub>	0.050	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
2-Nitrophenol-d <sub>4</sub>	0.050	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
2,4-Dichlorophenol-d <sub>3</sub>	0.060	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
Dimethylphthalate-d <sub>6</sub>	0.300	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
Acenaphthylene-d <sub>8</sub>	0.400	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
4-Nitrophenol-d <sub>4</sub>	0.010	40.0	± 40.0	± 50.0
Fluorene-d <sub>10</sub>	0.100	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol-d <sub>2</sub>	0.010	40.0	± 30.0	± 50.0
Anthracene-d <sub>10</sub>	0.300	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0
Pyrene-d <sub>10</sub>	0.300	20.0	± 25.0	± 50.0
Benzo(a)pyrene-d <sub>12</sub>	0.010	20.0	± 20.0	± 50.0
Fluoranthene-d <sub>10</sub> (SIM)	0.400	20.0	± 25.0	± 50.0
2-Methylnaphthalene-d <sub>10</sub> (SIM)	0.300	20.0	± 20.0	± 25.0

<sup>1</sup> If a closing CCV is acting as an opening CCV, all target analytes must meet the requirements for an opening CCV.

**Note:** If analysis by SIM technique is requested for PAH/pentachlorophenols, calibration standards analyzed at 0.10, 0.20, 0.40, 0.80, and 1.0 ng/uL for each target compound of interest and the associated DMCs. Pentachlorophenol will require only a four point initial calibration at 0.20, 0.40, 0.80, and 1.0 ng/uL.

## DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

All criteria were met   X    
Criteria were not met  
and/or see below \_\_\_\_\_

## CONTINUING CALIBRATION VERIFICATION

Compliance requirements for satisfactory instrument calibration are established to ensure that the instrument is capable of producing and maintaining acceptable quantitative data.

Date of initial calibration: 08/03/16 (SIM)  
Date of initial calibration verification (ICV): 08/03-04/16  
Date of continuing calibration verification (CCV): 08/10/16  
Date of closing CCV: -  
Instrument ID numbers: GCMS4M  
Matrix/Level: Aqueous/low

Date of initial calibration: 08/03/16 (Scan)  
Date of initial calibration verification (ICV): 08/03/16  
Date of continuing calibration verification (CCV): 08/10/16  
Date of closing CCV: -  
Instrument ID numbers: GCMSF  
Matrix/Level: Aqueous/low

DATE	LAB FILE ID#	CRITERIA OUT RFs, %RSD, %D, r	COMPOUND	SAMPLES AFFECTED

**Note:** Initial and continuing calibration verifications meet the method and guidance document required performance criteria. No closing calibration verification included in data package. No action taken, professional judgment.

**Actions:**

**Notes:** Verify that the CCV is run at the required frequency (an opening and closing CCV must be run within 12-hour period).

All DMCs must meet the RRF values given in Table 2. No qualification of the data is necessary on DMCs RRF and %RSD/%D alone. Use professional judgment to evaluate DMCs and %RSD/%D data in conjunction with DMCs recoveries to determine the need for qualification of the data.

**Qualify the initial calibration analytes listed in Table 2 using the following criteria in the CCVs:**

## DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

**Table 4. CCV Actions for Semivolatile Analysis**

Criteria for Opening CCV	Criteria for Closing CCV	Action	
		Detect	Non-detect
CCV not performed at required frequency and sequence	CCV not performed at required frequency	Use professional judgment R	Use professional judgment R
CCV not performed at specified concentration	CCV not performed at specified concentration	Use professional judgment	Use professional judgment
RRF < Minimum RRF in Table 2 for target analyte	RRF < Minimum RRF in Table 2 for target analyte	Use professional judgment J or R	R
RRF $\geq$ Minimum RRF in Table 2 for target analyte	RRF $\geq$ Minimum RRF in Table 2 for target analyte	No qualification	No qualification
%D outside the Opening Maximum %D limits in Table 2 for target analyte	%D outside the Closing Maximum %D limits in Table 2 for target analyte	J	UJ
%D within the inclusive Opening Maximum %D limits in Table 2 for target analyte	%D within the inclusive Closing Maximum %D limits in Table 2 for target analyte	No qualification	No qualification

## DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

All criteria were met   X    
Criteria were not met  
and/or see below \_\_\_\_\_

### BLANK ANALYSIS RESULTS (Sections 1 & 2)

The assessment of the blank analysis results is to determine the existence and magnitude of contamination problems. The criteria for evaluation of blanks apply only to blanks associated with the samples, including trip, equipment, and laboratory blanks. If problems with any blanks exist, all data associated with the case must be carefully evaluated to determine whether or not there is an inherent variability in the data for the case, or if the problem is an isolated occurrence not affecting other data.

List the contamination in the blanks below. High and low levels blanks must be treated separately.

Notes: The concentration of non-target compounds in all blanks must be less than or equal to 10 ug/L.

The concentration of target compounds in all blanks must be less than its CRQL listed in the method.

Samples taken from a drinking water tap do not have an associated field blank.

#### Laboratory blanks

DATE ANALYZED	LAB ID	LEVEL/ MATRIX	COMPOUND	CONCENTRATION UNITS
_No_target_analytes_detected_in_method_blanks._				

#### Field/Equipment/Trip blank

DATE ANALYZED	LAB ID	LEVEL/ MATRIX	COMPOUND	CONCENTRATION UNITS
_No_field/trip/equipment_blanks_analyzed_with_this_data_package._				

**Note:**

# DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

All criteria were met   X    
 Criteria were not met  
 and/or see below           

## BLANK ANALYSIS RESULTS (Section 3)

### Blank Actions

Qualify samples based on the criteria summarized in Table 5:

**Table 5. Blank and TCLP/SPLP LEB Actions for Semivolatile Analysis**

Blank Type	Blank Result	Sample Result	Action
Method, TCLP/SPLP LEB, Field	Detect	Non-detect	No qualification
	< CRQL	< CRQL	Report at CRQL and qualify as non-detect (U)
		≥ CRQL	Use professional judgment
	≥ CRQL	< CRQL	Report at CRQL and qualify as non-detect (U)
		≥ CRQL but < Blank Result	Report at sample results and qualify as non-detect (U) or as unusable (R)
		≥ CRQL and ≥ Blank Result	Use professional judgment
	Grossly high	Detect	Report at sample results and qualify as unusable (R)
	TIC > 5.0 ug/L (water) or 0.0050 mg/L (TCLP leachate) or TIC > 170 ug/Kg (soil)	Detect	Use professional judgment

List samples qualified

CONTAMINATION SOURCE/LEVEL	COMPOUND	CONC/UNITS	AL/UNITS	SQL	AFFECTED SAMPLES



# DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

All criteria were met   X    
 Criteria were not met  
 and/or see below       

## SURROGATE SPIKE RECOVERIES – DEUTERATED MONITORING COMPOUNDS (DMCs)

Laboratory performance of individual samples is established by evaluation of surrogate spike recoveries – deuterated monitoring compounds. All samples are spiked with surrogate compounds prior to sample analysis. The accuracy of the analysis is measured by the surrogate percent recovery. Since the effects of the sample matrix are frequently outside the control of the laboratory and may present relatively unique problems, the validation of data is frequently subjective and demands analytical experience and professional judgment.

Notes: Recoveries for DMCs in samples and blanks must be within the limits specified in Table 6.

The recovery limits for any of the compounds listed in Table 6 may be expanded at any time during the period of performance if USEPA determines that the limits are too restrictive.

If a DMC is not added in the samples and blanks or the concentrations of DMCs in the samples and blank not the specified, use professional judgment in qualifying the data.

**Table 7. DMC Actions for Semivolatile Analysis**

Criteria	Action	
	Detect	Non-detect
%R < 10% (excluding DMCs with 10% as a lower acceptance limit)	J-	R
10% ≤ %R (excluding DMCs with 10% as a lower acceptance limit) < Lower Acceptance Limit	J-	UJ
Lower Acceptance limit ≤ %R ≤ Upper Acceptance Limit	No qualification	No qualification
%R > Upper Acceptance Limit	J+	No qualification

List the percent recoveries (%Rs) which do not meet the criteria for DMCs (surrogate) recovery.

Matrix: Groundwater

**SAMPLE ID**

**SURROGATE COMPOUND**

**ACTION**

DMCs meet the required criteria. Non-deuterated surrogates added to the samples were  
within laboratory recovery limits.

# DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

**Table 8. Semivolatile DMCs and the Associated Target Analytes**

<b>1,4-Dioxane-d<sub>8</sub> (DMC-1)</b>	<b>Phenol-d<sub>5</sub> (DMC-2)</b>	<b>Bis(2-Chloroethyl) ether-d<sub>8</sub> (DMC-3)</b>
1,4-Dioxane	Benzaldehyde Phenol	Bis(2-chloroethyl) ether 2,2'-Oxybis(1-chloropropane) Bis(2-chloroethoxy) methane
<b>2-Chlorophenol-d<sub>4</sub> (DMC-4)</b>	<b>4-Methylphenol-d<sub>4</sub> (DMC-5)</b>	<b>4-Chloroaniline-d<sub>4</sub> (DMC-6)</b>
2-Chlorophenol	2-Methylphenol 3-Methylphenol 4-Methylphenol 2,4-Dimethylphenol	4-Chloroaniline Hexachlorocyclopentadiene Dichlorobenzidine
<b>Nitrobenzene-d<sub>5</sub> (DMC-7)</b>	<b>2-Nitrophenol-d<sub>4</sub> (DMC-8)</b>	<b>2,4-Dichlorophenol-d<sub>3</sub> (DMC-9)</b>
Acetophenone N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine Hexachloroethane Nitrobenzene 2,6-Dinitrotoluene 2,4-Dinitrotoluene N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	Isophorone 2-Nitrophenol	2,4-Dichlorophenol Hexachlorobutadiene Hexachlorocyclopentadiene 4-Chloro-3-methylphenol 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol 1,2,4,5-Tetrachlorobenzene *Pentachlorophenol 2,3,4,6-Tetrachlorophenol
<b>Dimethylphthalate-d<sub>6</sub> (DMC-10)</b>	<b>Acenaphthylene-d<sub>8</sub> (DMC-11)</b>	<b>4-Nitrophenol-d<sub>4</sub> (DMC-12)</b>
Caprolactam 1,1'-Biphenyl Dimethylphthalate Diethylphthalate Di-n-butylphthalate Butylbenzylphthalate Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate Di-n-octylphthalate	*Naphthalene *2-Methylnaphthalene 2-Chloronaphthalene *Acenaphthylene *Acenaphthene	2-Nitroaniline 3-Nitroaniline 2,4-Dinitrophenol 4-Nitrophenol 4-Nitroaniline

# DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

<b>Fluorene-d<sub>10</sub> (DMC-13)</b>	<b>4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol-d<sub>2</sub> (DMC-14)</b>	<b>Anthracene-d<sub>10</sub> (DMC-15)</b>
Dibenzofuran *Fluorene 4-Chlorophenyl-phenylether 4-Bromophenyl-phenylether Carbazole	4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	Hexachlorobenzene Atrazine *Phenanthrene *Anthracene
<b>Pyrene-d<sub>10</sub> (DMC-16)</b>	<b>Benzo(a)pyrene-d<sub>12</sub> (DMC-17)</b>	
*Fluoranthene *Pyrene *Benzo(a)anthracene *Chrysene	3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine *Benzo(b)fluoranthene *Benzo(k)fluoranthene *Benzo(a)pyrene *Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene *Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene *Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	

\*Included in optional Target Analyte List (TAL) of PAHs and PCP only.

**Table 9. Semivolatile SIM DMCs and the Associated Target Analytes**

<b>Fluoranthene-d<sub>10</sub> (DMC-1)</b>	<b>2-Methylnaphthalene-d<sub>10</sub> (DMC-2)</b>
Fluoranthene	Naphthalene
Pyrene	2-Methylnaphthalene
Benzo(a)anthracene	Acenaphthylene
Chrysene	Acenaphthene
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	Fluorene
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	Pentachlorophenol
Benzo(a)pyrene	Phenanthrene
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	Anthracene
Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	

# DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

All criteria were met \_\_\_\_\_  
 Criteria were not met \_\_\_\_\_  
 and/or see below \_\_\_\_\_X\_\_\_\_\_

## VII. A MATRIX SPIKE/MATRIX SPIKE DUPLICATE (MS/MSD)

This data is generated to determine long term precision and accuracy in the analytical method for various matrices. This data alone cannot be used to evaluate the precision and accuracy of individual samples. If any % R in the MS or MSD falls outside the designated range, the reviewer should determine if there are matrix effects, i.e. LCS data are within the QC limits but MS/MSD data are outside QC limit.

### 1. MS/MSD Recoveries and Precision Criteria

The laboratory should use one MS and a duplicate analysis of an unspiked field sample if target analytes are expected in the sample. If target analytes are not expected, MS/MSD should be analyzed.

**NOTES:** Data for MS and MSDs will not be present unless requested by the Region.  
 Notify the Contract Laboratory COR if a field or trip blank was used for the MS and MSD.

For a Matrix Spike that does not meet criteria, apply the action to only the field sample used to prepare the Matrix Spike sample. If it is clearly stated in the data validation materials that the samples were taken through incremental sampling or some other method guaranteeing the homogeneity of the sample group, then the entire sample group may be qualified.

List the %Rs, RPD of the compounds which do not meet the criteria.

Sample ID: JC25442-2

Matrix/Level: Groundwater

The QC reported here applies to the following samples:  
 JC25442-1, JC25442-2, JC25442-3, JC25442-4

Method: SW846 8270D BY SIM

Compound	JC25442-2 ug/l	Q	Spike ug/l	MS ug/l	MS %	Spike ug/l	MSD ug/l	MSD %	RPD	Limits Rec/RPD
Naphthalene	ND a		2.04	1.54	75	2.04	1.59	78	3	23-140/36
1,4-Dioxane	49.8		2.04	44.8	0* b	2.04	42.7	0* b	5	20-160/30

(a) Result is from Run #2.

(b) Outside control limits due to high level in sample relative to spike amount.

**Note:** MS/MSD % recoveries and RPD within laboratory control limits except in the cases described in this document. No action taken, 1,4-dioxane outside control limits due to high level in sample relative to spike amount.

- \* QC limits are laboratory in-house performance criteria, LL = lower limit, UL = upper limit.
- \* If QC limits are not available, use limits of 70 – 130 %.

## DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

### Actions:

QUALITY	%R < LL	%R > UL
Positive results	J	J
Nondetects results	R	Accept

MS/MSD criteria apply only to the unspiked sample, its dilutions, and the associated MS/MSD samples:

If the % R for the affected compounds were < LL (or 70 %), qualify positive results (J) and nondetects (UJ).

If the % R for the affected compounds were > UL (or 130 %), only qualify positive results (J).

If 25 % or more of all MS/MSD %R were < LL (or 70 %) or if two or more MS/MSD %Rs were < 10%, qualify all positive results (J) and reject nondetects (R).

A separate worksheet should be used for each MS/MSD pair.

## DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

All criteria were met   X    
Criteria were not met  
and/or see below       

### INTERNAL STANDARD PERFORMANCE

The assessment of the internal standard (IS) parameter is used to assist the data reviewer in determining the condition of the analytical instrumentation.

List the internal standard area of samples which do not meet the criteria.

DATE	SAMPLE ID	IS OUT	IS AREA	ACCEPTABLE RANGE	ACTION
------	-----------	--------	---------	------------------	--------

Internal area meets the required criteria of batch samples corresponding to this data package.

#### Action:

1. If an internal standard area count for a sample or blank is greater than 213.0% of the area for the associated standard (opening CCV or mid-point standard from initial calibration) (see Table 10 below):
  - a. Qualify detects for compounds quantitated using that internal standard as estimated low (J-).
  - b. Do not qualify non-detected associated compounds.
2. If an internal standard area count for a sample or blank is less than 20.0% of the area for the associated standard (opening CCV or mid-point standard from initial calibration):
  - a. Qualify detects for compounds quantitated using that internal standard as estimated high (J+).
  - b. Qualify non-detected associated compounds as unusable (R).
3. If an internal standard area count for a sample or blank is greater than or equal to 50.0%, and less than or equal to 213% of the area for the associated standard opening CCV or mid-point standard from initial calibration, no qualification of the data is necessary.
4. If an internal standard RT varies by more than 10.0 seconds: Examine the chromatographic profile for that sample to determine if any false positives or negatives exist. For shifts of a large magnitude, the reviewer may consider partial or total rejection of the data for that sample fraction. Detects should not need to be qualified as unusable (R) if the mass spectral criteria are met.
5. If an internal standard RT varies by less than or equal to 10.0 seconds, no qualification of the data is necessary.

## DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

**Note:** Inform the Contract Laboratory Program Project Officer (CLP PO) if the internal standard performance criteria are grossly exceeded. Note in the Data Review Narrative potential effects on the data resulting from unacceptable internal standard performance.

State in the Data Review Narrative if the required internal standard compounds are not added to a sample or blank or if the required internal standard compound is not analyzed at the specified concentration.

**Actions:**

**Table 10. Internal Standard Actions for Semivolatile Analysis**

Criteria	Action	
	Detect	Non-detect
Area response < 20% of the opening CCV or mid-point standard CS3 from ICAL	J+	R
20% ≤ Area response < 50% of the opening CCV or mid-point standard CS3 from ICAL	J+	UJ
50% ≤ Area response ≤ 200% of the opening CCV or mid-point standard CS3 from ICAL	No qualification	No qualification
Area response > 200% of the opening CCV or mid-point standard CS3 from ICAL	J-	No qualification
RT shift between sample/blank and opening CCV or mid-point standard CS3 from ICAL > 10.0 seconds	R	R
RT shift between sample/blank and opening CCV or mid-point standard CS3 from ICAL < 10.0 seconds	No qualification	No qualification

## DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

All criteria were met   X    
 Criteria were not met  
 and/or see below           

### TARGET COMPOUND IDENTIFICATION

#### Criteria:

Is the Relative Retention Times (RRTs) of reported compounds within  $\pm 0.06$  RRT units of the standard RRT [opening Continuing Calibration Verification (CCV) or mid-point standard from the initial calibration].  
**Yes? or No?**

List compounds not meeting the criteria described above:

Sample ID	Compounds	Actions
=====	=====	=====
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Mass spectra of the sample compound and a current laboratory-generated standard [i.e., the mass spectrum from the associated calibration standard (opening CCV or mid-point standard from initial calibration)] must match according to the following criteria:

- All ions present in the standard mass spectrum at a relative intensity greater than 10% must be present in the sample spectrum.
- The relative intensities of these ions must agree within  $\pm 20\%$  between the standard and sample spectra (e.g., for an ion with an abundance of 50% in the standard spectrum, the corresponding sample ion abundance must be between 30-70%).
- Ions present at greater than 10% in the sample mass spectrum, but not present in the standard spectrum, must be evaluated by a reviewer experienced in mass spectral interpretation.

List compounds not meeting the criteria described above:

Sample ID	Compounds	Actions
=====	=====	=====
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Identified compounds meet the required criteria



## DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

### Action:

1. The application of qualitative criteria for GC/MS analysis of target compounds requires professional judgment. It is up to the reviewer's discretion to obtain additional information from the laboratory. If it is determined that incorrect identifications were made, qualify all such data as unusable (R).
2. Use professional judgment to qualify the data if it is determined that cross-contamination has occurred.
3. Note in the Data Review Narrative any changes made to the reported compounds or concerns regarding target compound identifications. Note, for Contract Laboratory COR action, the necessity for numerous or significant changes.

### TENTATIVELY IDENTIFIED COMPOUNDS (TICS)

NOTE: Tentatively identified compounds should only be evaluated when requested by a party from outside of the Hazardous Waste Support Section (HWSS).

#### List TICs

Sample ID	Compound	Sample ID	Compound
=====			
_____		_____	
_____		_____	
_____		_____	
_____		_____	

### Action:

1. Qualify all TIC results for which there is presumptive evidence of a match (e.g. greater than or equal to 85% match) as tentatively identified (NJ), with approximated concentrations. TICs labeled "unknown" are qualified as estimated (J).
2. General actions related to the review of TIC results are as follows:
  - a. If it is determined that a tentative identification of a non-target compound is unacceptable, change the tentative identification to "unknown" or another appropriate identification, and qualify the result as estimated (J).
  - b. If all contractually-required peaks were not library searched and quantitated, the Region's designated representative may request these data from the laboratory.
3. In deciding whether a library search result for a TIC represents a reasonable identification, use professional judgment. If there is more than one possible match, report the result as "either compound X or compound Y". If there is a lack of isomer specificity, change the TIC result to a nonspecific isomer result (e.g., 1,3,5-trimethyl benzene to trimethyl benzene isomer) or to a compound class (e.g., 2-methyl, 3-ethyl benzene to a substituted aromatic compound).
4. The reviewer may elect to report all similar compounds as a total (e.g., all alkanes may be summarized and reported as total hydrocarbons).

## DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

5. Target compounds from other fractions and suspected laboratory contaminants should be marked as "non-reportable".
6. Other Case factors may influence TIC judgments. If a sample TIC match is poor, but other samples have a TIC with a valid library match, similar RRT, and the same ions, infer identification information from the other sample TIC results.
7. Note in the Data Review Narrative any changes made to the reported data or any concerns regarding TIC identifications.
8. Note, for Contract Laboratory COR action, failure to properly evaluate and report TICs

## DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

All criteria were met   X    
 Criteria were not met  
 and/or see below           

### SAMPLE QUANTITATION AND REPORTED CONTRACT REQUIRED QUANTITATION LIMITS (CRQLS)

#### Action:

1. When a sample is analyzed at more than one dilution, the lower CRQL are used unless a QC exceedance dictates the use of higher CRQLs from the diluted sample. Samples reported with an "E" qualifier should be reported from the diluted sample.
2. If any discrepancies are found, the Region's designated representative may contact the laboratory to obtain additional information that could resolve any differences. If a discrepancy remains unresolved, the reviewer must use professional judgment to decide which value is the most accurate. Under these circumstances, the reviewer may determine that qualification of data is warranted. Note in the Data Review Narrative a description of the reasons for data qualification and the qualification that is applied to the data.
3. For non-aqueous samples, if the solids is less than 10.0%, use professional judgment for both detects and non-detects. If the percent solid for a soil sample is greater than or equal to 10.0% and less than 30.0%, use professional judgment to qualify detects and non-detects. If the percent solid for a soil sample is greater than or equal to 30.0%, detects and non-detects should not be qualified (see Table 11).
4. Note, for Contract Laboratory COR action, numerous or significant failures to accurately quantify the target compounds or to properly evaluate and adjust CRQLs.
5. Results between MDL and CRQL should be qualified as estimated "J".
6. Results < MDL should be reported at the CRQL and qualified "U". MDLs themselves should not be reported.

Table 11. Percent Solids Actions for Semivolatile Analysis for Non-Aqueous Samples

Criteria	Action	
	Detects	Non-detects
%Solids < 10.0%	Use professional judgment	Use professional judgment
10.0% ≤ %Solids ≤ 30.0%	Use professional judgment	Use professional judgment
%Solids > 30.0%	No qualification	No qualification

### SAMPLE QUANTITATION

The sample quantitation evaluation is to verify laboratory quantitation results. In the space below, please show a minimum of one sample calculation:

Sample ID:   JC25442-2\_MS\_(SIM)   Analyte:   Naphthalene   RF:   2.470  

$$\begin{aligned}
 [ ] &= (71830)(4.0)/(153856)(2.470) \\
 &= 0.76 \text{ ppm} \quad \text{Ok}
 \end{aligned}$$

## DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

## QUANTITATION LIMITS

**A. Dilution performed**

[illegible]

## DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

All criteria were met \_\_\_\_\_  
 Criteria were not met \_\_\_\_\_  
 and/or see below \_\_\_\_\_ N/A \_\_\_\_\_

### FIELD DUPLICATE PRECISION

Sample IDs: \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_

Matrix: \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_

Field duplicate samples may be taken and analyzed as an indication of overall precision. These analyses measure both field and lab precision; therefore, the results may have more variability than laboratory duplicates which only laboratory performance. It is also expected that soil duplicate results will have a greater variance than water matrices due to difficulties associated with collecting identical field duplicate samples.

The project QAPP should be reviewed for project-specific information.

Suggested criteria: if large RPD (> 50 %) is observed, confirm identification of the samples and note differences. If both samples and duplicate are <5 SQL, the RPD criteria is doubled.

COMPOUND	SQL ug/L	SAMPLE CONC.	DUPLICATE CONC.	RPD	ACTION
No field/laboratory duplicate analyzed as part of this data package. MS/MSD % recovery RPD used to assess precision. RPD within the required guidance document criteria < 50 % for detected target analytes above 5 SQL.					

## DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

All criteria were met   X    
Criteria were not met  
and/or see below       

### OTHER ISSUES

#### A. System Performance

List samples qualified based on the degradation of system performance during sample analysis:

Sample ID	Comments	Actions
=====	=====	=====
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Action:

Use professional judgment to qualify the data if it is determined that system performance has degraded during sample analyses. Inform the Contract Laboratory Program COR any action as a result of degradation of system performance which significantly affected the data.

#### B. Overall Assessment of Data

List samples qualified based on other issues:

Sample ID	Comments	Actions
=====	=====	=====
_____	_____	_____
_No other issues that required the need to qualify the data. Results are valid and can be used for decision purposes. Other discrepancies are shown below._____		
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Note:

Action:

1. Use professional judgment to determine if there is any need to qualify data which were not qualified based on the Quality Control (QC) criteria previously discussed.
2. Write a brief narrative to give the user an indication of the analytical limitations of the data. Inform the Contract Laboratory COR the action, any inconsistency of the data with the Sample Delivery Group (SDG) Narrative. If sufficient information on the intended use and required quality of the data is available, the reviewer should include their assessment of the usability of the data within the given context. This may be used as part of a formal Data Quality Assessment (DQA).

## DATA REVIEW WORKSHEETS

3. Sometimes, due to dilutions, re-analysis or SIM/Scan runs are being performed, there will be multiple results for a single analyte from a single sample. The following criteria and professional judgment are used to determine which result should be reported:
- The analysis with the lower CRQL
  - The analysis with the better QC results
  - The analysis with the higher results